

IN THE DRAWINGS:

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR §1.83 because there was not a flow chart of Claim 2's steps (i)-(vi). A replacement drawing is being furnished herewith, which provides a flow chart of the steps as recited in Claim 2, with respect to the one or more servers.

Replacement Sheets for all the drawings, Figs. 1-13, are being submitted herewith.

REMARKS

The Office Action dated January 4, 2011 has been reviewed carefully and the application has been amended in a sincere effort to place it in condition for allowance.

Claims 2, 21, 23-24, 48-51 are currently pending in the case. Claims 22, 28 and 29 were cancelled herein.

Objection to the Drawings

New Fig. 13 is added to address the Examiner's objection. A new paragraph has been added describing new Fig. 13. Replacement sheets for Figs. 1-12 are also being submitted herewith.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 2, 21-24, 28-30, 48 and new claims 49-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant has amended Claim 2 to address the matters raised in paragraph 9 of the Office Action. It is respectfully submitted that Claim 2 now complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Specifically, Claim 2 has been amended to address each of the Examiner's 112 rejections. For example, in Claim 2, lines 8 -9, the application has been amended to state that the mail piece is a "physical" mail piece. It is also noted that Applicant has amended Claim 2 to include the paragraph identification numbers for each step as suggested by the Examiner. The Applicant respectfully thanks the Examiner for this suggestion for clarification.

Applicant submits that the "linked information," is linked to the mail piece and

includes information about the mail piece, such as its delivery status information, address and other particulars. The linking is between the mail piece and a user identifier, which in turn is associated with the respective user. Applicant has addressed the Examiner's query regarding the user, by amending the claim to recite: "thereby providing a user, being a sender or recipient of a mail piece, by way of its respective user identifier, with the capability to track and trace mail pieces."

With regard to the receiving step, Applicant has amended the claim to indicate that the receiving step occurs at the server. The attachment and the linked information are posted on an associated website.

Applicant respectfully submits that it has been clarified throughout the claim that the user is the individual who is receiving a package or has sent a package. The inventive system allows that user to trace and track his mail piece (package). The linked information is information about the mail piece that is mapped to a respective user identifier, and in turn, to the user.

Applicant has made similar amendments throughout Claim 21 which is a computer executable instructions claim. Claim 23 has been amended to recite that the messages are electronic, and it is respectfully submitted that this amendment addresses the Examiner's comments there upon. Claim 24 has been amended to recite a graphic user interface. Claim 28-30 have been cancelled. Claim 48 is system claim which relates to one or more servers and a plurality of computer nodes as the structure upon which the claimed steps are carried out.

Claim Rejections – 37 C.F.R. §1.75

The Claims were rejected under 37 C.F.R. §1.75 regarding multiplicity, which

states in part that the application presents an unreasonable number of claims which are repetitious and multiplied.

In order to address this rejection, Applicant has cancelled Independent Claim 22, Independent Claim 28 and Independent Claim 29.

The Application, as amended, includes three independent claims: Claim 2 is directed to a mail piece tracking system that, *inter alia*, includes one or more servers configured to perform steps (i) – (vii); Claim 21 is directed to computer executable instructions; and Claim 48 is directed to a mail piece tracing and tracking system comprising one or more servers and a plurality of computer nodes.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Application, as amended, overcomes the multiplicity rejection.

SUMMARY

In a brief telephone conversation with the Examiner, Applicant's representative indicated that an amended claim set addressing Examiner's 112 rejections would be submitted. The Examiner and the undersigned representative of the Application indicated that prosecution would be furthered by addressing only the §112 rejections, at this juncture.

All of the claims have been amended either directly or through dependency, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner deem a telephone conversation with the undersigned will further the prosecution of the application, he is invited to please contact the undersigned at his convenience.

Please charge any additional fee occasioned by this paper to our Deposit Account
No. 03-1237.

Respectfully submitted,

/Rita M. Rooney/
Rita M. Rooney
Reg. No. 30,585
CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP
88 BLACK FALCON AVENUE
BOSTON, MA 02210
Telephone: (617) 951-2500
Facsimile: (617) 951-3927